

### Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed February 1, 2008.

#### I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed February 1, 2008, Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 15-18 and 20-21 were objected to. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Murray et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,874,143 B1, hereafter Murray).

#### II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Response amends Claims 15-18 and 20-21, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21. Reconsideration of the Application as amended is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

#### III. Claim Objections

In the Office Action mailed February 1, 2008, Claims 15-18 and 20-21 were objected to. Specifically, it was submitted in the Office Action that applicant does not provide antecedent basis for the claim terminology "machine readable storage medium" and "computer readable storage medium." It is respectfully submitted that paragraph [0096] does provide support for the claim terminology "computer readable storage medium" because paragraph [0096] states "stored on any one of the computer readable medium." Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the Office Action mailed February 1, 2008, Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Murray et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,874,143 B1, hereafter Murray).

#### Claim 1

In the Office Action mailed February 1, 2008, Murray was submitted as disclosing *wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated with*

*another extension in the plurality of extensions* because Murray appears to disclose a EDFHub that receives multiple EDFs and merges them together as a single list (column 22, lines 44-45). Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, in the cited passage of Murray, there appears to be no mention of an extension that exposes and consumes serves associated with another extension. First, in the cited passage of Murray, an EDFHub was disclosed as merging individual EDFs together and exposes them into a list. However, the EDFHub is a part of the software architecture configured to process multiple EDFs and thus not an extension.

Second, the exposing of the individual EDFs into a list does not appear to disclose exposing or consuming the services of an extension. Instead, Murray merely disclosed the merging of a list of EDFs, which did not appear to involve any consumption of services associated with an extension.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited reference, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 8 and 15**

For reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 8 and 15, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-11, 13-14, 16-18, and 20-21**

Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-11, 13-14, 16-18, and 20-21 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-11, 13-14, 16-18, and 20-21 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also respectfully submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

#### **V. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the

Application No.: 10/786,772  
Office Action mailed: February 1, 2008  
Reply to Office Action dated: May 1, 2008

claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 1, 2008

By: Guanyao Cheng  
Guanyao Cheng  
Reg. No. 58,555

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800